DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 383 014 CS 508 921

AUTHOR Burroughs, Nancy F.; Marie, Vicki
TITLE Speaking in English Scares Me: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Native and Non-native Language Use on Communication Orientations in Micronesia.
PUB DATE Feb 95
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western States Communication Association (Portland, OR, February 10-14, 1995).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Communication; *Communication Apprehension; Communication Research; Cross Cultural Studies; Cultural Differences; English (Second Language); Extraversion Introversion; Higher Education; Language of Instruction; *Language Role; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Micronesia; Nonnative Speakers

ABSTRACT

By the year 2010, it is projected that in the United States no single ethnic group will hold the majority. Even though a variety of other languages will be represented, English will probably remain as the "common" communication tool between and among ethnic and racial groups. An investigation focused on the impact of language and cultural diversity on communication in college classrooms. More specifically, students (n=131) from the Community College of Micronesia, Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia), a culturally mixed population which speaks English as its second (third or fourth) language, were asked to indicate their apprehensions about communicating, their willingness to initiate conversations, their level of extroversion/introversion or talkativeness, and how competent they perceived themselves to be while communicating in English and in their native language. The ages of respondents ranged from 16 to 48 with a mean age of 23.21. Comparisons indicated significant differences between orientations of students in the two cultures and within the Micronesian culture itself, as well as between the sexes. Perhaps the study's most significant contribution is its support of the conclusion that when individuals are asked to communicate with one another, their communication orientations may be influenced directly by the language they choose or are required to use. That is, when individuals are forced to use a non-native language to communicate, their overall orientation to communication may change. In this case experience increased apprehension, decreased willingness to initiate communication, and decreased perceptions of communication competence. (Contains 29 references and 5 tables of data.) (TB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 383 014

Speaking in English Scares Me: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Native and Non-native Language Use on Communication Orientations in Micronesia

Nancy F. Burroughs
Department of Dramatic Arts and Communication
Mills College
5000 MacArthur Boulevard
Oakland, CA 94613
(510) 447-2622

Vicki Marie
Communication Skills Department
San Joaquin Delta College
5151 Pacific Avenue
Stockton, CA 95207
(209) 474-5544

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

CS509921

Running Head: COMMUNICATION ORIENTATIONS IN MICRONESIA

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

By the year 2010, it is projected that there will be no single ethnic group that holds the majority. Even though a variety of other languages will be represented, English will probably remain as the "common" communication tool between and among ethnic and racial groups. This investigation focused on the impact of language and cultural diversity on communication in college classrooms. More specifically, Students from the Community College of Micronesia, a culturally-mixed population who speak English as their second (3rd or 4th) and common language were asked to indicate their apprehensions about communicating, their willingness to initiate conversations, their level of extroversion/introversion or talkativeness, and how competent they perceived themselves to be while communicating in English (non-native language) and in their native language. Comparisons indicated significant differences between orientations of students in the two cultures and within the Micronesian culture itself. Additional findings indicated that significant sex differences exist between male and female students in Micronesia. Results are interpreted as having both cultural and language bases.

Speaking in English Scares Me:
A Cross-Cultural Comparison of
Native and Non-native Language Use
on Communication Orientations in Micronesia

With the increasing multiethnic and multicultural character of the U.S. American society, the term "melting pot" has become somewhat obsolete. Cultural pluralism more accurately describes the current U.S. American culture. This cultural shift has become a central encompassing theme of interest, study and concern in education, business, and government. With the increased cultural diversity in our nation, it is desirable to increase intercultural communication competence which enhances interpersonal and business relationships through understanding and appreciation of other cultures.

Ideally, people living in a pluralistic society appreciate the contributions of each group to the common community and support the maintenance of different cultures. The problem, however is the fact that with increased intercultural contact comes increased opportunity for misunderstanding (Jenson 1970). This contact is termed "intercultural communication" and refers to the communication process between people of different cultural backgrounds. To help us understand the complexities of intercultural communication, Samovar and Porter (1991) offer this definition: "Intercultural communication occurs whenever a message produced by member of one culture for consumption by a

member of another culture, a message that must be understood" (pg. 10).

Intercultural communication research examines what occurs when the communication situation involves culturally diverse people. It has been suggested that the initial impetus for the systematic study of intercultural communication was to prevent international conflict leading to global annihilation. Currently, researchers are also concerned with the need for effective communication skills which are appropriate to national (multicultural communities, organizations, and education), and international communication (travel, the marketplace, and governmental affairs) including culturally diverse societies which operate as a "global village."

The general study begins with the assumption that people from different cultures use different adaptive strategies in their communication behaviors. These strategies, which perpetuate within a culture, result in predictable communication behaviors for each particular group. Through observation and analysis, scholars are able to determine how communication styles and behaviors contribute to degrees of shared meaning or conflict. The information gained may assist intercultural communicators in progressing from ethnocentrism to appreciating and valuing other cultures and, as a result, more satisfying communication outcomes.

Intercultural communication research has, so far, provided a

general orientation toward intercultural communication, theorized about the analysis of intercultural transactions (Yum, 1991.), given insights into cultural differences (Barnlund, 1975; Hofstede, 1980), and made practical suggestions for behavioral strategies which may improve intercultural communication (Gudykunst & Kim, 1984). Research increases the cultural awareness required for peaceful co-exist among people who may not share experiences, beliefs, values, or world views. With the increased cultural mix in the U.S. and ongoing contact with international cultures it is vitally important for scholars to continue pursuing a broader understanding of the constructs that affect communication behavior. Using the variables of Communication Apprehension, Self-Perceived Communication Competence, Introversion/extroversion, and Willingness to Communicate, this paper is a comparison study designed to determine the impact on a communication situation when communicating with English as a non-native (second, third or fourth) language.

Communication and Orientations:

Communication Apprehension, Shyness, Willingness to Communicate and Reticence have been popular communication constructs over the past two decades (Payne & Richmond, 1984). Although the majority of research related to these orientations has focused on U.S. American samples, researchers have sought to determine their affect upon behavior in cultures outside the U.S. Examples

include Japan, Korea, Australia, Germany, England, People's Republic of China, Puerto Rico, South Africa, Israel, India, the Philippines, Finland, Taiwan, Sweden and Micronesia (Barraclough, Christophel, & McCroskey, 1988; McCroskey, Burroughs, Daun, and Richmond, 1990); McCroskey, Gudykunst, & Nishada, 1985; Klopf, 1984). These studies reveal significant differences in levels of Communication Apprehension and its related constructs among these cultures.

Specific research which pertains to the focus of this paper begins with a 1980 study (Bruneau, Cambra, & Klopf) which compared the degree of CA of Micronesians with mainland U.S. American students. The authors reported no significant differences between the two groups. A 1984 study (Klopf) noted that Micronesians were significantly less apprehensive than Hawaiian-Americans, and Japanese, but significantly more apprehensive than Koreans and Filipinos, with no difference between Micronesians and Australians or Chinese. Recently, a study involving Micronesian students (Burroughs & Marie, 1991) focused on their Willingness to Communicate. Communication Apprehension (CA), Self-Perceived Communication Competence, and Introversion were also measured and compared to normative data collected in the U.S. (McCroskey, Fayer, & Richmond, 1985). The specific purpose was to determine whether or not CA is more or less predictive of willingness to communicate as it affects different cultures and if Micronesians are more or less willing

to communicate than U.S. Americans.

The results indicated that U.S. American and Micronesian college students differ in their reported communication orientations. Micronesians reported themselves to be more apprehensive and introverted, while perceiving themselves as less competent and willing to communicate when they fear communication events, or perceive themselves as introverts and/or incompetent communicators. The group of Micronesian students studied indicated that perceived competence plays a significant role in determining their predisposition toward communication. Self-perceived competence can predict 64 percent of the WTC variance for Micronesians as compared to only 35 percent for U.S. Americans. This comparison indicates that significant differences exist in communication orientations across cultures. Given the impact of self-perceived communication competence on willingness to communicate it is important to investigate the research which suggests a relationship between CA and second language speakers.

A number of studies indicate that communicators experience higher CA when using non-native languages than when speaking in their native language (Fayer, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1985; Allen & Andriate, 1984; Applbaum, Applbaum & Trotter, 1986.) Fayer, et al reported that Puerto Rican students are "far more <u>fearful</u> about communicating in their second language (English)." In addition, it is reported that an ESL speaker is more likely to block communication if he/she is uncomfortable speaking English

(Dulay & Burt, 1977). As a result, the degree of perceived competence of the second language speakers involved impacts their communication interaction.

It was noted in our primary study (1991) that the differences found between American and Micronesian students may be explained, in part, by examining the "language" used in their communication interactions. It was noted that nine different major Micronesian languages with various dialects are spoken in the Federated States of Micronesia and that (non-native) English is the lingua franca used in government, education, and other intercultural contexts. For most, Micronesians English is their second language; for others it is their third of fourth and, thus, the language with which they are least secure. One of the authors, who taught at the college, experienced several continuing education students who appeared to understand course lectures but when spoken to individually it became apparent that they understood very little English.

It has been argued (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987; Stevick, 1976) that several factors in addition to CA influence a persons willingness to communicate. Of particular interest in these studies are the variables of self-perceived communication competence and culture. It has been determined that norms which affect communication behavior vary across cultures and ethnic groups. Communication behavior is guided, influenced, and founded on the norms, values, and language of a particular culture.

Micronesian Culture

The majority of Americans are not aware of the vast northern ocean area of Micronesia. Micronesia, meaning "tiny islands" is a series of archipelagoes comprised of approximately 2500 islands with a combined land mass about the size of Rhode Island. These islands are scattered across an area covering three million square miles, an area as large as the continental United States. Although Micronesia has been the focus of several anthropological studies, it has been largely undiscovered in popular consciousness. Western influence, however, dates back to 1830's when whaling and trading ships frequented the shores of Micronesian islands. Despite the one hundred and sixty years of contact with foreigners, Micronesians have not given up their traditional politics, languages, or family organization. Changes, though, were unavoidable and as a result island life is currently an amalgam of traditional and western acculturation.

> "A well dressed, western educated Micronesian, working in a government office, lunching at an oriental restaurant, and drinking 'sundowners' at an American-style bar, might well appear on the surface to have switched cultures and adopted bastardized customs. However, this same individual can often speak three different languages interchangeably in conversation with a friend and can move into traditional culture as quickly and completely as he can change clothes into a 'thu' or a 'lava lava' and with a truly remarkable

ability to fit comfortably in both" (Ashby 1983 ix).

Outward appearances can be deceiving. Many Micronesians are fairly comfortable moving between modern ideas and old traditions but this does not automatically mean that they think the same as Westerners. Micronesian people and their communities are also affected by political maneuvering between the high chiefs of island districts and government politicians. However, an important key to understanding Micronesian culture is in the pervasive traditional political system.

Typically each of the districts on an island has a status system that is delineated as hereditary nobility, landed gentry, and commoners. Each district is ruled by a Nanmwarki which translates to "High Chief." Below the Nanmwarki is a group of high-titled nobles. A second set of nobles is headed by the Nahnken, or "talking chief." These men are the decision-makers and the most highly revered in traditional culture. They are bestowed with much respect which is demonstrated, among other ways, in being addressed in a "high language"--an honorific language with special vocabulary reserved for nobility and authority. Additionally, a commoner or outsider always stands when talking to nobility, responds rather than initiates communication, and casts eyes downward to convey humility and respect.

Another significant cultural component influencing communication behavior is gender roles. The roles of men and

women in Micronesian traditional cultures are well-defined with relatively few variations. Typically, men are the chiefs, the spokesmen, and the decision makers. Women are the homemakers, landlords, and the chief negotiators. Traditionally, women are not suppose to speak during village or community meetings. This norm is changing as more and more women take responsible positions in community affairs. One of the most significant roles that women play is in conflict resolution.

An important cultural value of Micronesian people is social harmony. Courtesy, respect, and politeness are constant themes found in each household as well as in the community. It is critical to a community's well-being that all conflicts be resolved in a manner that is acceptable to all parties involved. Usually, the female head of the clan is sent to settle the dispute and reconcile the two sides.

There is strong emphasis on the family in Micronesian life and social harmony expected within a family. Disputes between family members are looked down upon and strongly discouraged. Children are taught this value at a very early age and are made to feel great shame if a dispute occurs.

In general, there are few rules dictating childrens' behavior. However, strict rules prohibit children from initiating conversation with an elder.

It was amazing to live with so many children who took seriously the saying, 'kids should be seen and not heard."

> The children did not interrupt the adults or cause the disturbances that mark most western households with even one child underfoot. They did not ask questions nor vie for attention. I saw this behavior many times. Although children are a constant presence at all occasions, they are not disruptive. Neither, however, will they converse with or answer questions from adults (Ward, 1989).

Children are expected to respond to elders using the "high language." An elder is defined as anyone older than the child including siblings. As an example, this rule prohibits a college freshman from initiating conversation with a sophomore, albeit there are circumstances which, for practical reasons (i.e., classroom interaction) people switch to an egalitarian style but not without discomfort. Above all, respect is the most important value expressed in the guiding rule "Be humble, don't put yourself up."

Generally, Micronesians do not openly give complements and it is difficult for them to accept compliments. They admire people silently or behind their back. If a person wants to compliment another he/she will pass the complement through a relative rather than acknowledge the person directly. If an unknowing outsider gives a Micronesian a complement the response given would resemble "shyness." A girl will "giggle," blush, and move away quickly. A boy might turn his body away from the sender or flip his hand chest-high in a gesture that communicates "stop" or "go

away." These nonverbal responses are done in a friendly way but it is quite clear that the receiver is extremely uncomfortable. The reactions were explained to one of the authors in this way: The receiver is uncomfortable with praise because he/she does not want to be perceived as thinking he/she is "big" or better than anybody else.

It has been observed that although Micronesians resist public acknowledgment they value sophisticated oratory and skilled speech.

> At every homestead, at every public gathering, and on the paths between, I heard styles of speech that were not covered in the classic anthropological articles by my colleagues. I heard people proud of their linguistic virtuosity, marking themselves off from others by the skills of their tongues. Sometimes I thought this was a game they played on each other and certainly on us because I could find no reason for the war of words. Yet, in this verbal chess or poker, they scored points by speaking of themselves with humility and modesty while exalting their opponents to absurd levels of status. This game, if indeed my view is correct, fits into the Pohnpeian personality of public modesty and private ambition. Life in Wene seemed to be a covert verbal competition. (Ward, 1989).

Justification

In our initial research we argued that the importance in understanding the similarities and differences between

Micronesians and Americans lies in the continuous political and social transactions between the two groups. Additionally, there are increasing numbers of Pacific Islanders immigrating to the U.S. which presents challenges for communicators from such contrasting cultural backgrounds.

The authors would presently offer a third justification for studying Micronesians--their cultural diversity. Although Micronesians may initially be perceived by an outsider as a homogeneous culture, upon closer inspection each island group has distinct physical features, a separate language, and a unique cultural identity. Like U.S. Americans, when a diverse group of Micronesians converge to common ground, they also must accommodate and negotiate ideas to reach task goals and social harmony. Given the similarities in cultural diversity between Micronesia and the U.S., findings from research which measures Micronesians' communication orientations can be extrapolated and used to help understand intercultural communication within the U.S.

Thesis:

Using the variables previously measured, this paper is a comparison study designed to determine the impact on a communication situation when communicating with English as a non-native (second) language.

From the results of the primary research and one of the author's extensive interaction with Micronesian students it was

hypothesized that the statistical differences could be explained (in part) by, first, recognizing the cultural differences in social expectations (norms and values) and secondly by noting that the Micronesian students responded to instruments designed for an U.S. American population. Although English is the lingua franca of the Federated States of Micronesia, it is a non-native language. Additionally, some of the social situations offered in the statements were irrelevant to the Micronesian culture.

Method

Subjects:

Participants were 131 (47 females, 68 males and 16 who did not indicate) undergraduate students enrolled in classes at the Community College of Micronesia, located on Pohnpei in the Federated States of Micronesia. The ages of respondents ranged from 16 to 48, with a mean age of 23.21. Cultural groups represented by primary language in this sample included Pohnpeian (59), Kosraen (19), Trukese (20), Yap Proper-main island (6), Yap Outer Island (13), Marshallese (7), and Palauan (7). We also sought to measure the language of Kapingamarange, but participants failed to correctly answer and return our measures. It should be noted, that 43 files were deleted from the original sample due to sampling errors, (i.e., we assumed participants from Truk for example could both read and speak Trukese. Due to this false assumption, many files were incomplete or scored incorrectly). The courses sampled fulfilled general education

requirements across the college and students represented a diversity of major fields. All instruments were translated (with the assistance of students, staff, and faculty at the Community College of Micronesia) into eight Micronesian languages: Marshallese, Kosraen, Pohnpeian, Trukese, Yapese (main island), Yapese (outer island), Palauan and Kapingamarange.

Each instrument was initially translated by a native speaker. Next, each instrument was proofed and edited by a second native speaker, and back-translated by a third. Demographic data was also collected. Instruments were completed with no personal identification to insure anonymity and to increase the probability of honest responses.

Measures:

All of the measures employed in this study were self-report scales. Participants were given instruments written in their native language and instructed to respond to all statements in the context of communicating with others in their native language.

Additionally, the authors developed two open-ended questions to measure the respondents communication experience and perceived norms and rules dictating communicating behavior.

The variables measured in this study were as follows:

Willingness to Communicate: The WTC scale (McCroskey and Richmond, 1987) was used as the operationalization of willingness to communicate. This is a 20-item instrument with 12 items

composing the measure and eight filler items. In a previous study (McCroskey & Baer, 1985) the internal (alpha) reliability reported for the total scale was .92. The reliability of the scale in this investigation was .86

Self-Perceived Communication Competence: The SPCC scale developed by McCroskey and McCroskey (1986c, 1988) was used as the operationalization of self-perceived communication competence. The SPCC scale consists of 12 items. Four communication contexts were included public speaking, meetings, small groups, and dyads and three types of receivers (strangers, acquaintances, and friends). The internal (alpha) reliability estimates of the total scale in earlier research (McCroskey, Burroughs, Daun, & Richmond, 1990; McCroskey & McCroskey, 1988) were .92 and .93. In the present study, the internal reliability estimate for the scale was .90

Communication Apprehension: The Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA24, McCroskey, 1982) was used as the operationalization of communication apprehension. Four context included public speaking, meetings, groups, and dyads. Previous internal (alpha) reliability estimates reported for the total score have ranged from .91 to .96. In the present study the reliability for the total scale was .87.

Introversion: The measure used for introversion/extraversion was drawn from the work of Eysenck (1970, 1971). A total of eighteen items appeared on the instrument, 12 measuring

introversion/extraversion and 6 neurotism items serving as fillers. The same items were used as were included in the earlier study reported by McCroskey and McCroskey (1986 a). The internal (alpha) reliability estimates of the scale used in-earlier research was .77. In the present study it was .70.

Data Analysis

The focus of the present investigation was on the influence of English as a second language on communication orientations of Micronesian students. The data from earlier reports of research in the U. S. (Burroughs, & Marie, 1991, McCroskey & Baer, 1985; McCroskey, Fayer & Richmond, 1985; and McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986 a, b, c) were used to make comparisons. Specifically, comparisons were made between U. S. American students and Micronesian students in regard to their native language communication orientations (English for U. S. Americans and one of seven languages for Micronesians). Furthermore, comparisons were made between Micronesian students scores from an English as a second language orientation (non-native) and their native language orientation. Similarly correlations among total scores were computed for each instrument. Differences between means of U.S., non-native speaking Micronesian (ESL) and native speaking Micronesian scores were tested for significance with t-tests. For differences between correlations, z-tests were computed. The criterion for significance was set for .05.

Results

Table 1 reports the mean and standard deviation for each score on the WTC, SPCC, PRCA24, and Introversion instruments for both the present sample (non-native: Micronesian2) and comparable groups in previous U. S. studies. Also reported are the mean differences between the two cultural groups and the t-test for each difference.

Insert Table 1 here

As reflected in Table I, Micronesian students responding in their native language were significantly less willing to communicate with others (with the exception of communication with strangers) than comparable U. S. students. Native speaking Micronesian students also reported to perceive themselves to be significantly less competent at communicating, more introverted, and more apprehensive than U. S. American students. With the exception of WTC on the stranger subscore, and the public speaking subscore on the PRCA24, where no significant difference was found, these total score findings were supported by subscores on each instrument (WTC, SPCC, and PRCA24). That is, native speaking Micronesian students reported to be less willing to communicate, perceived themselves as less competent, and more apprehensive than U. S. American students with receivers who were acquaintances, friends or strangers (except WTC). Moreover,

native speaking Micronesians also scored significantly lower in willingness to communicate, perceived communication competence, and higher in communication apprehension in the contexts of meetings, groups and dyads. Native speaking Micronesians also reported themselves to be less communicatively competent and willing to communicate in context of public speaking. These results are generally consistent with the previous study (Burroughs & Marie, 1991) which compared the communication orientations between U.S. and Micronesian students communicating in English.

Table 2 reports the mean and standard deviation for each score on the WTC, SPCC, PRCA24 and Introversion instruments for both the present sample (native speaking Micronesian) and the previous non-native speaking Micronesians (ESL). Also reported are the mean differences between the two groups and the t-test for each difference.

Insert Table 2 here

As reflected in Table 2, native speaking Micronesians (Micronesian2) were significantly more willing to communicate, perceived themselves to be more communicatively competent, more introverted and less apprehensive about communication than non-native speaking Micronesians (Micronesian1). These findings were generally supported by subscores on each instrument (WTC, SPCC

and PRCA24). No significance was found between the two groups on the subscore of friends in regard to their willingness to communicate, Furthermore, the two groups reported no significant difference in the context of groups with regard to their perceived level of competence or communication apprehension. Finally, no difference was found between the reported scores of communication apprehension in the context of meetings. Consequently, these results indicate that native speaking Micronesians feel more willing to communicate, more communicatively competent and less apprehensive about communication, while communicating and responding in their native language than Micronesians who were requested or required to communicate with others in a second (perhaps third or forth) language. The one notable exception was found in the area of introversion, where students communicating in their native language reported to feel significantly more introverted than students communicating in English (non-native language).

Insert Table 3 here

Table 3 reports the observed correlations and z-tests for differences among the measures for native speaking Micronesian students and comparable U.S. students. No significant differences were found among the measures between the two groups. These findings suggest that English speaking U.S. students and native

speaking Micronesian students perceive no differences in their communication orientations while speaking in their native (first) language.

Insert Table 4 here

Table 4 reports the observed correlations and z-tests for difference among the measures for native and non-native speaking Micronesian students. Correlations between WTC and SPCC were the only measures to be significantly different at alpha .05. This finding is consistent with the previous study between U.S. American students and English speaking Micronesian students. This result may suggest that in general, Micronesians' willingness to communicate is directly related to their perceived communication competence whether they are speaking in the native or non-native language. Although the association of this perception is reported to be much less while speaking in their native language (r=.59) than speaking in a non-native language (r=. 80).

Insert Table 5 here

Table 5 reports the means, variances accounted for, and critical values for differences between males and females on each instrument. Previous U.S. studies have repeatedly found no sex

differences between male and female subjects. In the previous study (Burroughs & Marie, 1991), significant differences were found between the sexes of non-native Speaking Micronesians with regard to their willingness to communicate (F=11.56, df-1/157, eta2=.07), self-perceived communication competence (F=11.01, df=1/157, eta2=.07), and communication apprehension (F=21.47, df=1/156, eta2=.12), with no reported sex differences in reported introversion. In this study, significance was found between the sexes with native speaking Micronesians with regard to their reported WTC (F=4.83, df=1/114, eta2=.04), communication apprehension (F=17.91, df=1/114, eta2=.14), and introversion (F=6.65, df=1/114, eta2=.06), with no sex differences reported with self-perceived communication competence. These results suggest that as a cultural group, Micronesian male students tend to be more willing to communicate and less apprehensive about communicating with others than female Micronesian students, regardless of the language used. However, difference do appear to exist in terms of reported introversion and perceived communication competence between the sexes when they are required to use their native or non-native language. That is, females tend to report themselves to be less competent than males while communicating in English, but do not perceive any differences while communicating in their native language. Whereas, males tend to report themselves to be significantly more introverted than females while communicating in their native language, but

reported no differences than females while communicating in English.

Discussion

The results of this investigation indicates that indeed some communication orientations are influenced by whether or not the communicator is called upon to communicate in his/her own native language or must communicate in a second, third or perhaps fourth language. In this study, Micronesians were asked to complete four instruments to assess their overall communication orientation in regards to their level of communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, willingness to communicate and introversion. The primary difference in this study than the earlier study was that Micronesian students were asked to respond to scales written in their own native language. Furthermore, these students were asked to report their orientations about communication while communicating in their native language. The previous study asked Micronesian students to respond to English written measures about communication orientations while communicating in English. Comparisons of the results indicate that non-native (English) speaking Micronesians continue to report higher levels of communication apprehension and introversion and lower levels of self-perceived communication competence and willingness to communicate than U.S. American students. However, it was also found that native speaking Micronesian students perceived

themselves to be more communicatively competent and willing to communicate than non-native speaking Micronesians. While at the same time, native speaking Micronesian students reported lower levels of communication apprehension. These findings are consistent with previous studies examining the relationship between CA and ESL (Allen, Andriate, 1984; Fayer, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1984; McCann, Hecht, & Ribeau, 1986; McCroskey, Fayer, & Richmond, 1985; Miura, 1985). However, this study extends those studies by providing a broader picture of how communication orientations in general are linked to native and non-native speaking, For example, we found that not only are native speaking Micronesians less anxious, but perceived themselves as more competent and are more willing to initiate communication with others when given the opportunity to communicate in their first or native language. However, having this opportunity may not be easily available in some parts of the world, it is not uncommon for governments to establish laws to require one official language to be used in schools and work setting. This policy is found not only in the Federated States of Micronesia, but also in much of the United States. Therefore these results have important implications to CA treatment programs, ESL training workshops and to the broader context of education at all levels where communication behaviors are subject to internal and external evaluation standards.

In addition, to the above findings, another interesting finding

also emerged in this study, that is, native-speaking students reported themselves to be more introverted than non-native-speaking groups. When students were asked to communicate in their own language, their level of introversion increased. Why this occurred is unclear. One explanation may be that "introversion" may be distinctly a cultural variable linked to the source, context and rules about communication for Micronesians. For example, when asked about their cultural norms and comfort level, one student responded "the rule about talking to higher rank people is to be polite. We honor the higher title person." Another students added "we use high language for leaders and important people (elders). If you don't use appropriate language you are considered impolite and disrespectful. Following the rules in our culture is very important, which is why I don't like to communicate at feasts with traditional leaders." Consequently is appears that questions related to "introversion" may be related to cultural interpretation. In these cases, introversion may be interpreted as politeness or conformity. Micronesian may feel that while speaking in their own language they are much more "rule-govern" to follow the norms, and therefore experience higher levels of introversion or conformity. Future studies should examine whether or not the U.S. label of introversion (and its measures) do in fact measure introversion or some other phenomenon.

Finally, with regard to the sex differences found between male

and female Micronesians, it appears that the average female is apprehensive and less willing to communicate, while males are only moderately apprehensive and appear to be more willing to communicate. Interestingly, in this study, males reported to be more introverted than females while speaking in their native language. Results such as these may not be too surprising given that most Micronesians live in a highly traditional culture where chiefly hierarchies and class systems are still alive and well. Men and women are expected to follow specific communication rules, such as using "high language" with elders or avoiding public acknowledgement. As mentioned previously, the roles of women and men in Micronesia are well defined. Traditionally, women are suppose to be reserved, unless they attempting to negotiate some sort of conflict to maintain social harmony, Whereas, men are expected to be Chiefs and decision makers, requiring sharing of ideas and opinions. Perhaps native speaking male Micronesians report greater "introversion" (if there is such a construct in Micronesia) than females due to the strict gender role expectancies imbedded within their culture.

To conclude, we believe that this investigation offers some interesting conclusion about Micronesians communication orientations. Perhaps the most significant contribution of this study is its support of the conclusion that when individuals are asked to communicate with one another, their communication orientations may be influenced directly by the language they

choose or are required to use. That is, when individuals are forced to use a non-native language to communicate, their overall orientation to communication may change, in this case experience increased apprehension, decreased willingness to initiate communication and decreased perceptions of communication competence. Thus we have to question the impact of such changes on communication outcomes and perceptions. Failure to attend to these communication orientations in both education and business contexts will result in greater interaction difficulties among people with different cultural and language experiences. Consequently, educators and researchers should begin to develop plans and programs that recognize communication differences and difficulties, with special emphasis towards cultural understanding and communication effectiveness.

References

Allen, J.L., & Andriate, G.S. (1984). Communication Apprehension in bi-lingual non-native U.S residents. World Communication, 13, 39-48.

Applbaum, R.L., Applbaum, S.J., & Trotter, R.T. (1986). Communication apprehension and Hispanics: An exploration of communication among Mexican Americans. World Communication, 15, 11-29.

Ashby, G. (1985). Some things of value: Micronesian customs and beliefs (2nd ed.).Oregon: Rainy Day.

Barnlund, D.C. (1975). Public and private self in Japan and the United States. Tokyo: Simul Press. (pp. 3-24).

Barraclough, R.A., Christophel, D.M., & McCroskey, J.C. (1988). Willingness to communicate: A cross-cultural investigation. Communication Research Reports, 5(2), 187-192.

Bruneau, T., Cambra, R.E., & Klopf, D. (1980). Communication apprehension: Its incidence in Guam and elsewhere. Communication, 9, 46-52.

Burroughs, N.F., & Marie, V. (1991). Communication orientations of Micronesian and American students. Communication Research Reports, 7(2), 139-146.

Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1977). Remarks on creativity in language acquisition. In M.Burt H. Dulay, & M. Finnochiario (Eds.) Viewpoints on English as a second language. New York: Regents. (pp. 95-126).

Fayer, J.M., McCroskey, J.C., & Richmond, V.P. (1984). Communication apprehension in Puerto Rico and the United States I: Initial comparisons. Communication, 13(49-66).

Gudykunst, W.B., & Kim, Y.Y. (1984). Communication with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication. New York: Random House.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequence: International differences in work related values. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Jensen, J.V. (1970). Perspectives on nonverbal intercultural communication. In L.A. Samovar & R.E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader (6th ed.), (pp. 256-272). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Klopf, D.W. (1984). Cross-cultural apprehension research: A summary of Pacific Basic studies. In J.A. Daly & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.), Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence and communication apprehension (pp. 157-172). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McCain, L.D., Hecht, M.L., Ribeau, S. (1986). Communication apprehension and seconf language acquistion among vietnamese and mexican immigrants: A test of the affective filter hypothesis. Communication Research Reports, 3(33-38).

McCroskey, J. C., & Baer, J. E. (1985, November). Willingness to communicate: The construct and its measure. Paper presented

at the SPeech Communication Association, Denver, CO.

McCroskey, J. C., Burroughs, N. F., Daun, A., & Richmond, V. P. (1990). Correlates of quietness: Swedish and American perspectives. Communication Quartely, 38(2), 127-137.

McCroskey, J.C., Fayer, J.M., & Richmond, V.P. (1990). Don't speak to me in English: Communication apprehension in Puerto Rico. Communication Quarterly, 33(3), 185-192.

McCroskey, J. C., & McCroskey, L. L. (1986, February). Correlates of willingenss to communicate. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association convention, Tucson, AZ. (a)

McCroskey, J. C., & McCroskey, L. L. (1986, May). Predictors of willingness to communicate: Implications for screening and remediation. Paper presented at the International Communication Association convention, Chicago, IL. (b)

McCroskey, J. C., & McCroskey, L. L. (1986, November). Communication competence and willingness to communicate. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association convention, Chicago, IL. (c)

McCroskey, J.C., Gudykunst, W.B., & Nishida, T. (1985). Communication apprehension among Japanese students in native and second language. Communication Research Reports, 2 (1), 11-15.

McCroskey, J.C. & Richmond, V.P. (1987). Willingness to communicate. In J.C. McCroskey & J.A. Daly (Eds.), Personality and Interpersonal Communication. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Miura, S.Y. (1985). Communication apprehension and bi-dialectical speakers: An exploratory investigation. Communication Research Reports, 2(1-4).

Payne, S.K. & Richmond, V.P. (1984). A bibliography of related research and theory. In J.A. Daly & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.), Avoiding Communication:Shyness, Reticence, and Communication. (pp. 247-294). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Samovar, L.A. & Porter, R.E. (1991). Communication between cultures. Belmont, CA:Wadsworth.

Samovar, L.A. & Porter, R.E. (1991). Basic Principles of intercultural communication: A reader (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Stevick, E.W. (1976). Memory, meaning, and method. Rowly, MA: Newbury House.

Ward, M.C. (1989). Nest in the wind. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Yum, J.O. (1991). The impact of Confucianism on interpersonal relationships and communication patterns in East Asia. In L.A. Samovar & R.E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural Communication: A Reader, (6th ed.), (pp. 66-78). Belmont, CA:Wadsworth.

Table 1
Mean, Standard deviation, and Mean Comparisons for Subscores and Total Scores on Measures**

Measures	(U.S.) Mean	(U.S.) S.D.	Micronesia Mean	Micronesia S.D.	U.S. X-Micro X	t*
WTC	63.1A	14.9	55.9D	17.0	7.2	4.26*
Public	52.2	20.4	57.4	23.1	-5.2	-2.26*
Meeting	59.3	18.6	50.1	21.4	9.2	4.34*
Group	68.1	16.4	56.5	19.2	11.6	6.12*
Dyad	72.9	15.8	59.8	20.6	13.1	6.58*
Stranger	35.6	21.3	34.1	20.8	1.5	.70
Acquaint-ance	69.9	18.5	63.1	21.0	6.8	3.26*
Friend	83.9	14.0	70.7	19.5	13.2	7.08*
SPCC	73.7A	13.8	61.9D	16.5	11.8	7.27*
Public	68.8	17.8	61.9	20.6	6.9	3.38*
Meeting	68.8	17.1	49.6	23.6	19.2	8.45*
Group	76.1	14.6	52.8	21.7	23.3	11.35*
Dyad	81.1	12.4	72.7	16.7	8.4	5.23*
Stranger	55.5	23.6	40.5	24.4	15.0	6.04*
Acquaint-ance	77.4	15.3	72.2	19.0	5.2	2.81*
Friend	88.2	11.3	73.0	20.3	15.2	8.11*
Introver-sion	19.0B	4.7	24.4D	4.2	-5.4	-11.09*
PRCA-24	65.6C	15.3	74.3D	14.5	-8.7	-4.96*

Public	19.3	5.1	20.0	4.0	-0.7	-1.31
Meeting	16.4	4.8	19.1	5.1	-2.7	-4.61*
Group	15.4	4.8	18.0	4.8	-2.6	-4.59*
Dyad	14.5	4.2	17.3	4.5	-2.8	-5.43*

*p < .05 significant
**Converted to 0-100 scale
A) n=344
B) n=216
C) normative U.S. data (McCroskey, Fayer, & Richmond, 1985).
D). n=131
Micronesia $_2$ = Native language responses

Table 2
Mean, Standard Deviations, and Mean Comparisons
for Subscores and Total Scores on Measures**

Measures	$Micronesia_1$ Mean	$Micronesia_1$ S.D.	$Micronesia_2$ Mean	$Micronesia_2$ S.D.	$Micro_1$ X - $Micro_2$ X	t*
WTC	47.3A	16.8	55.9B	17.0	-8.6	-4.31*
Public	47.0	20.9	57.4	23.1	-10.4	-3.98*
Meeting	37.4	20.5	50.1	21.4	-12.7	-5.13*
Group	55.2	20.9	56.5	19.2	-1.3	-0.55
Dyad	50.0	21.9	59.8	20.6	-9.8	-3.92*
Stranger	22.9	21.1	34.1	20.8	-11.2	-4.53*
Acquaint-ance	44.4	24.7	63.1	21.0	-18.7	-6.97*
Friend	74.5	21.1	70.7	19.5	3.8	1.59
SPCC	49.0A	18.4	61.9B	16.5	-12.9	-6.29*
Public	35.8	14.2	61.9	20.6	-26.1	-12.29*
Meeting	39.4	21.5	49.6	23.6	-10.2	-3.81*
Group	53.8	21.0	52.8	21.7	1.0	0.40
Dyad	57.3	18.8	72.7	16.7	-15.4	7.38*
Stranger	25.4	22.1	40.5	24.4	-15.1	-8.37*
Acquaint-ance	43.7	27.5	72.2	19.0	-28.5	-10.40*
Friend	77.8	21.4	73.0	20.3	4.8	1.96*
Introver-sion	21.8A	4.4	24.4B	4.2	-2.6	-5.13*

PRCA-24	76.6A	14.9	24.3B	14.5	52.3	30.20*
Public	21.7	4.0	20.0	4.0	1.7	3.60*
Meeting	18.9	4.6	19.1	5.1	-0.2	-0.35
Group	17.3	4.4	18.0	4.8	-0.7	-1.28
Dyad	18.8	4.8	17.3	4.5	1.5	2.74*

*p < .05 significant
** Converted to 0-100 scale
A) n=159
B) n=131
Micronesia $_1$ = English as a non-native language responses
Micronesia $_2$ = Native language responses

Table 3
Correlations Among Communication Measures

Measure	U.S. r	U.S. n	Micronesia r	Micronesia n	z*
WTC/PRCA24	-.52	428	-.37	131	1.86
WTC/SPCC	.59	344	.59	131	0
WTC/INTRO-VERSION	-.29	242	.35	131	-.60
PRCA24/SPCC	-.63	216	-.51	131	1.67
PRCA24/ INTROVER-SION	.33	216	-.41	131	-.83
SPCC/INTRO-VERSION	-.37	216	-.38	131	-.12

*p < .05
Micronesia $_2$ = Native language responses

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4
Correlations Among Communication Measures

Measure	Micronesia$_1$ r	Micronesia$_1$ n	Micronesia$_2$ r	Micronesia$_2$ n	z*
WTC/PRCA24	-.52	159	-.37	131	1.58
WTC/SPCC	.80	159	.59	131	3.96*
WTC/INTRO-VERSION	.41	159	.35	131	.60
PRCA24/SPCC	-.49	159	.-51	131	-.23
PRCA24/IN-TROVERSION	-.37	159	-.41	131	-.47
SPCC/INTRO-VERSION	.36	159	.38	131	-.19

*$p < .05$
Micronesia $_1$ = English as a non-native language responses
Micronesia $_2$ = Native language responses

Table 5
Mean, Standard Deviations, and
Mean Comparisons for Sex on Measures

Measure	U.S. M/F**	Micronesia$_2$ Males	Micronesia$_2$ Females	eta^2	F* Value
WTC	63.1	57.9	51.0	.04	4.83*
SPCC	73.7	62.4	58.3	.02	1.75
Introversion	19.0	24.9	22.8	.06	6.65*
PRCA24	65.6	70.6	81.4	.14	17.91*

*$p < .05$
**No significant difference found in U.S. samples
Micronesia $_2$ = Native language responses